UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/067,795	04/28/98	DOVEK M	3123-276

022442
SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER CO 80202

WM01/0522

EXAMINER	
LETSCHER, G	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2652	23

DATE MAILED: 05/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 23

Application Number: 09/067,795
Filing Date: April 28, 1998
Appellant(s): Dovek et al.

Mr. David Sigmund
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 3/7/01.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

The rejection of claims 1-60 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

5,486,967	Tanaka et al	1-1996
5,434,733	Hesterman et al	7-1995
4,423,450	Hamilton	12-1983
5,097,371	Somers	3-1992

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 10-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21, 24-27, 29-34, 37, 42-50, 53, 55, 57-58 & 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 3.

Claims 1-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hesterman et al in view of Hamilton. This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 18.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Somers in view of Hamilton. This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 10.

(11) Response to Argument

On page 6 of the brief, as well as page 9 Appellant alleges that "Tanaka et al does not even remotely resemble a substantially Lorentzian pulse shape" and that "the inventors of the present invention discovered that a yoked MR read element can provide a readback signal with a substantially Lorentzian pulse shape in response to a perpendicular magnetic polarity." Appellant then contends at the top of page 7 "that a conventional non-yoked MR read element can provide a readback signal with a substantially Lorentzian pulse shape in response to a longitudinal magnetic polarity" while the "conventional yoked MR read element can provide a readback signal that resembles a step function in

response to a longitudinal magnetic polarity." The Examiner maintains that Tanaka et al shows the combination of the perpendicular recording media and flux-guided (yoked) MR head. This combination is described in the application at page 14, lines 21-26, as producing a readback pulse signal with a Lorentzian-type pulse shape. Therefore, the head of Tanaka et al must also produce a readback pulse signal with a Lorentzian-type pulse shape. Tanaka et al inherently contains circuitry for receiving signals from the MR element which were genrated by its interaction with the perpendicular recording medium.

On page 15 of the remaks, Appellant contends that neither Hesterman et al nor Hamilton teach that a "yoked MR readback element produces readback pulses with substantially Lorentzian pulse shapes in response to perpendicular magnetic storage transitions in a storage media." The Examiner maintains that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the head of Hesterman to read information from perpedicular recording media. The readback pulse from the perpendicular recording media would have a substantially Lorentzian pulse shape.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE J. LETSCHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

GJL
May 21, 2001

David Sigmund
Maxtor Corporation
2190 Miller Drive
Longmont, CO 80501-6744

WILLIAM KLIMOWICZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER
conferee